DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 358 IR 000 845

AUTHOR	Shively, Joe E.; And Others
TITLE	Home-Oriented Preschool Education: Evaluation of the Prototype Home Visitor Training Package. Technical Report No. 45.
INSTITUTION	Appalachia Educational Lab., Charleston, W. Va.
PUB DATE	31 Jan 74
NOTE	86p.; For related documents see IR 000 839-844
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Television; Evaluation Techniques; *Home Instruction; Home Study; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Parent Education; Preschool Children; *Preschool Education; *Program Evaluation; Rural Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Appalachia Educational Laboratory; Home Oriented Preschool Education; Project HOPE

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the HOPE (Home-Oriented Preschool Education) Training Package for home visitors (paraprofessional educators) was performed. The home visitor is one part of the three-way--home, group, television--integrated instruction program being developed by the Appalachian Educational Laboratory for the education of preschoolers. The preservice portion of the HOPE package consists of five modules and was administered at four different sites to 101 trainees. The evaluation consisted of observation, a Curriculum Specific Test (CST) with five parts corresponding to the five modules of the training program, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, a posttraining questionnaire, and a training module questionnaire. No significant results were reported for the attitude inventory except for a correlation with the CST. Some differences between sites on the CST were reported and generally all sites showed significant pre-post gains. The questionnaires provided information on the relative effectiveness of the modules and the general acceptability of the program. (WH)

ED 093358

HOME-ORIENTED PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Evaluation of the Prototype Home Visitor Training Package

Joe E. Shively
Brainard W. Hines
Ermel Stepp, Jr.
Charles L. Bertram

Technical Report No. 45

Research and Evaluation Division
Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
Charleston, West Virginia

January 31, 1974

IR 000 845

Table of Contents

Introduction. 1

Role of the Home Visitor 2

Purpose of Study 4

Description of Training Unit. 4

Evaluation Procedures 6

Description of Sites 7

Instrumentation. 8

Curriculum Specific Test. 8

Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. 9

Post-Training Questionnaire 10

Training Module Questionnaire 11

Observations by Evaluators. 12

Evaluation Design and Analysis Procedures. 12

Evaluation Results. 14

Analysis of Results of the CST 14

Analysis of Results of the MTAI. 20

Analysis of Results of the TMQ 20

Analysis of Results of the PTQ 23

Evaluation Summary. 24

Appendix A. 28

Appendix B. 30

Appendix C. 33

Appendix D. 35

Appendix E. 47

Appendix F. 49

Table of Contents (Continued)

Appendix G. 51

Appendix H. 59

Appendix I. 66

Appendix J. 73

List of Tables

Table No.		Page
1	Means, Standard Deviations, and N's for Pre and Post-Test Curriculum Specific Measures Across Sites	15
2	CST Data Results Summary Table.	19
3	MTAI Pre and Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations by Sites and Total Sample	20
4	Percentage Responses of Trainees on the Items of the Training Module Questionnaire (TMQ) by Modules and Across Modules.	22

Introduction

The Marketable Preschool Education Program (MPEP), being developed by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL), is a three-way integrated approach to education for three-, four-, and five-year-old children. It includes the use of home instruction, group instruction, and televised instruction.

The first component involves a trained paraprofessional who goes to the home of each child in an assigned region once a week to deliver materials and supplies which are to be shared by the child and parent. This home visitor also spends time with both the child and parent in learning activities which benefit the child and, depending on the needs of the child and parent, spends time in discussion with the parent in an attempt to foster positive interactions with the child and to enable the parent to perform in an effective instructional role.

The second component involves group interaction. Once each week the child attends a two-hour session in a group setting with peers in a mobile classroom or convenient fixed location. Activities presented by a trained professional teacher are based on the objectives for the total program and serve to initiate supervised social interaction of children in small groups. These group activities reinforce material presented in the televised lessons and complement the efforts at home of parents and visiting paraprofessionals.

The third component involves televised instruction. It is used to initiate basic skill instruction, encourage the desire for learning, and provide new experiences for young children. Each lesson is 30 minutes long and the lessons are broadcast into the children's homes five days a week. Since the lessons are based on behavioral objectives, the emphasis is on attainment through entertaining program content.

Although each component is essential, individually each component is not sufficient to provide an adequate intervention program for preschool children. The MPE Program is designed to integrate the three components into a viable system of mutually complementary relationships which is cost effective in the attainment of desired, lasting effects in the life of the child.[1] The curriculum is planned and generated and then the strengths of each delivery mode are exploited to the fullest and the countervailing weaknesses are effectively countered in the integrated MPE system.

The terminal objective of the MPE Program is to make available to rural children a preschool education program which will: (a) utilize existing public and private television transmission facilities to deliver the program; (b) encourage multi-district and multi-state planning, funding, and implementation; (c) be more cost effective than the traditional classroom approach; (d) make use of paraprofessionals; and (e) involve and assist the parent in the instructional role.[2]

To successfully implement such an integrated program requires the use of paraprofessionals (home visitors) who have had training in the various aspects of the program. The degree to which the training has been successful will ultimately determine whether the program has been successfully implemented and the terminal objectives reached.

Role of the Home Visitor

The role of the home visitor is most accurately described as a function of the purposes of the weekly home visits and of the duties to be performed.

---

[1]See Appendix J for a complete listing of previous evaluation reports which document this effectiveness.

[2]Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc. Marketable Preschool Education Program: Basic Program Plan. Charleston, W. Va.: AEL, April, 1972.

The purposes of the weekly home visit are:

1. To enlist the participation of the parent directly in the educational experiences of the child.
2. To support the parents in using their skills, knowledge, and personal resources to effectively interact with the child to further the dignity and self-respect of both parent and child.
3. To sustain the interest and participation of the parent and child in the program.
4. To provide materials related to TV and to assist the parent in adapting these materials to the individual needs of the child.
5. To assist the parent in extending and reinforcing the child's learning by using activities related to specific objectives.
6. To observe and discuss the needs of each child with the parent and to refer these needs to either the materials production team, or unit team, whichever is appropriate. These referrals are to serve as a basis for planning of lessons and activities.
7. To provide the parent with information of community resources and assist in obtaining services as needed.
8. To gather data for evaluation purposes.

The duties to be performed by a home visitor include demonstrating through modeling certain basic techniques that are effective in teacher/learner interactions. It should be recognized that while the MPE Program

is built around the parent/child interaction, the teacher/learner labels must not be interpreted as adult/child. These roles can be reversed since the parent often learns from the child.

Home visitors also provide and interpret basic resource material to the parent, e.g., Parents' Guide, child activity materials, and other resources as needed. They interpret the objectives of the TV lessons and assist the parent in selecting appropriate learning experiences that serve the needs of the individual child. Home visitors serve as a resource to the parent in obtaining and providing information about available community resources that may be used for special needs the child or family may have and, if necessary, provide assistance in obtaining these services. Other duties include providing appropriate data to either the materials production team, unit team, or evaluation staff, as well as participating in weekly planning sessions with unit team staff members and attending inservice sessions planned by supervising staff.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to document evidence regarding the effectiveness of a preservice training package which is a necessity for implementation of the MPE Program. The evidence included in this report is being used by the developmental staff to make revisions in the training materials.

Description of Training Unit

The HOPE (Home-Oriented Preschool Education) Training Package is a group of materials designed to provide structure and content for training paraprofessional home visitors. The instructional content is modular in

form, with various sub-topics or components contained within each module. The components contain objectives to be taught, curriculum specific tests, teaching instructions, and media support suited to the topic. An instructional text provides a reference for the trainees to use and add to as they work and is included in an expanding notebook rather than a regular textbook.

Although the parent is the major focus of training, AEL cannot train parents directly and so must utilize the home visitor to transmit teaching techniques to the home. To facilitate parent change, a Parents' Notebook, similar to the Home Visitor Notebook, is planned for each parent. It contains basic materials which are supplemented by the home visitor throughout the year. See Appendix A for an outline of topic sections in these two notebooks.

The training sessions may also include other personnel of the home-based program, such as teachers and program directors. While the training materials are written specifically for home visitors, the topics of the modules are of interest to all the other personnel. Thus, the materials can be used with the total staff until specific modules are developed for staff other than home visitors.

Home visitor training is of two types--preservice and inservice. Preservice training takes place before the working year begins and covers ten five-hour days and includes six preservice modules. The titles of these preservice modules and an outline of the components within each will be found in Appendix B. The inservice modules follow the basic format of the preservice training but are designed to be of short duration (2-3 hours) and supplement the preservice training. A list of inservice topics which have been proposed is given in Appendix C.

The training package reflects the needs and competencies of the home visitor. These needs and competencies were compiled by the MPEP staff after perusing the research literature, communicating with other projects involved in home-based programs, interacting with previous HOPE home visitors,[3] and summarizing the MPEP staff's experiences.

The preservice training during the developmental period was done by training teams from AEL. These teams consisted of at least two persons experienced in teaching adults and/or working with parents and children of preschool age. In addition to the teaching team, an evaluator was present to gather data measuring the effectiveness of the preservice training.

As was mentioned above, the maximum length of training was ten (10) days. The ultimate product of the field trials is a total package of teaching modules that include all materials a program would need to train the personnel for a home-based program. The trainer's directions are sufficiently detailed, materials (written and audiovisuals) adequately explicit, and the evaluation amply complete to make the package an intact training program. Each training module is seen as a complete unit which can be utilized at the local level with little or no assistance from AEL.

Evaluation Procedures

The procedures used to evaluate the HOPE prototype home visitor training package are described below. A description of the training sites, the instrumentation used in data collection, and the evaluation design and analysis procedures are presented.

---

[3] J. Shively and F. Gregory. AEL Home Visitors' Perceptions of Their Roles. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., April, 1973.

Description of Sites

In order to test training materials to establish their worthiness, training sites were identified and then the materials were presented to personnel at those sites. To evaluate the HOPE training materials, four sites in relatively rural settings were selected.

The first training site was located in Huntsville, Alabama. There were 26 individuals who completed the total training program which was conducted from September 5 through September 14, 1973. Reports from the site indicated the trainees received training on health services in addition to the HOPE training package. They are currently using the HOPE model, funded through National Home Start as a demonstration site.

The second training site was in Gallipolis, Ohio, and was also conducted from September 5 through September 14, 1973. There were 12 individuals who completed the training program at this site. Reports from this site indicated that the trainees received instructions on health services, nutrition, and social services from other sources. They are also using the HOPE model, funded through a variety of sources including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Social Security.

The third training site was in Warren County (Franklin), Ohio, from September 18 through September 28, 1973. There were 14 trainees who completed the training at this site. The program being operated was the standard Head Start model.

The fourth training site was held at California, Pennsylvania, from October 2 through October 11, 1973. There were 54 trainees involved in the program at this site. There were three different programs represented: (1) Armstrong County, (2) Washington County and Green County, all using the Head Start model, and (3) Pittsburgh, using a Home Start model.

As mentioned previously, a few of the trainees enrolled in the training program were individuals who would not be going into the homes on a regular

basis, i.e., as a home visitor. Job titles of such persons involved in the training included group experience teacher, bus driver/aide, nurse, social services coordinator, bus driver/custodian, cook/nutrition aide, and project director.

Instrumentation

There were several procedures used for collecting data about the training package. Three instruments were produced by the Research and Evaluation Division at AEL. One instrument was a standardized, norm-referenced test produced and distributed by a commercial agency. On-site observation by evaluators was also used. These procedures are described below.

Curriculum Specific Test. The Curriculum Specific Test (CST), devised for the Home Visitor Training Package, was used to assess the level of attainment of specific objectives included within each training module and to provide overall information on pretraining levels of attainment on those same areas.

The CST is composed of five subtests, corresponding to the five modular areas of instruction. These subtests measure content areas in instruction, the HOPE Process, use of materials, child development, and working with others. A total score for the test is derived by summing the individual subtest scores. There are 44 possible points on the Instruction subtest, 27 on that on Working With Others, 29 on the HOPE Process, 24 on Helping Children Grow and Develop, and 101 on Materials, giving a total possible score of 225 items.

Items for the CST were taken directly from the objectives for training, and each item on the test corresponds directly to a single activity within

an objective. However, the CST does not measure all of the training objectives, but rather includes only those which were not directly assessed as a part of the instruction. That is, approximately one-third of the objectives were assessed directly by the training staff from observation of the trainees' behavior, and no test items were created to measure attainment in those areas. An example of such an objective would be "The trainee will successfully complete a public announcement and present it orally."

A sample objective from the training which could be included in the CST is: "The trainees will identify two types of forms used in home visitations and specify the correct use of each." The corresponding items on the CST would then be: "List two types of home visit records and state the purpose of each." Thus, a single objective may include more than one corresponding item.

The content validity of the items thus derived is obvious and can be assumed to be relatively high since all objectives were taught during training, but predictive and concurrent validity of the CST have yet to be established. Also, because of the difficulty inherent in establishing specific reliability figures for the curriculum specific instrument, no such data are currently available.

Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) is a measure of teacher attitudes toward children, specifically aimed at assessing acceptance of children. It is composed of 150 items, selected from a pool of statements reflecting various attitudes of experienced and inexperienced teachers.

The items selected from the pool were chosen empirically by their ability to discriminate between effective and ineffective teachers, as defined by

supervisor and student ratings, as well as by independent observation and ratings.[4]

The 150 items are of the force-choice type in which the examinee is told to rank each statement along a five-point scale, ranging from "strongly agree" through "undecided" to "strongly disagree". A typical statement from the test might be "Children are too carefree."

strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Reliability of the test, as measured by the split-half method, is reported as ranging from .88 to .91. Test-retest and alternate form reliability figures are not reported.

Validation for the instrument has been established for concurrent and predictive validity, with validation (correlation) values ranging from .35 to .57 for experienced and inexperienced teachers. Content and construct validity has been established by the authors and is reported in the manual.

The MTAI was used as a supplemental evaluation instrument for the HOPE Training Package. It was given on a pre and post-test basis to all available trainees across the four sites to assess any changes in attitude which may have taken place as a result of training and for possible use in follow-up studies of the trainees.

Post-Training Questionnaire. A Post-Training Questionnaire (PTQ) was developed by AEL's Research and Evaluation Division. This instrument (see Appendix E) was designed to elicit from the trainees their opinions about the total training program that they had just completed. These impressions

---

[4]W. W. Cook, C. H. Leeds, & R. Callis. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951.

and feelings about the training and materials permit a revision of the program to be accomplished more accurately.

The PTQ was administered to the trainees at the end of the total training period. The PTQ contained nine items, some with subparts, to which the trainees were asked to respond. The items dealt with the various components and (1) their relationship to needs of a home visitor, (2) their degree of interpretability and understanding, (3) their immediate or future implementation or use potential, and (4) their relevance for continued inclusion in the program. Also included were items dealing with time allocated for training, training topics not included in the program, and an overall rating of the quality of the training.

Training Module Questionnaire. The Training Module Questionnaire (TMQ) was developed as an instrument for measuring trainees' reactions to separate areas of instruction during training. (See Appendix F for a copy of this instrument.) It was intended primarily as a means of rapid, "on-the-spot" feedback to trainers, but is also being used in the revision of the overall training package.

The questionnaire consists of seven items with three forced-choice responses for each. The responses follow a rough progression, but equal intervals of judgment cannot be assumed to exist between each of the three responses. For example, one items says "Right now I wish (a) I were home, (b) I could go on to the next presentation, (c) I could take this block of time over again." Only the frequencies of various responses are important on each item, and average scores are not possible across responses for a single item. Thus, only general interpretations of the data are possible.

In sites where a large number of trainees were present, the questionnaire was not administered to all trainees, but was given after a "block" of training (usually a single component) to a random sample of five to seven trainees. This sampling was done to simplify the scoring and data collection for this instrument. In sites with 15 or fewer trainees, the TMQ was given to all trainees. Because of the nature and purpose of this questionnaire, no data on validity or reliability are available.

Observations by evaluators. It should also be noted that although data were collected via paper and pencil instruments as described previously, evaluators were present at all training sites to take notes describing actual procedures used in presenting materials, overt expressions of trainees' receptivity to the materials, and other characteristics at the training sites. Such observations and notetaking were intended to provide insights into the success or failure of units within the training program as indicated by the "hard" data.

Evaluation Design and Analysis Procedures

A number of questions were asked with respect to changes in attitude and learning which took place as a result of the HOPE Training Package. Those questions considered to be the most important for evaluation of program effects are as follows:

1. Did initial knowledge of the training content areas and attitudes toward children differ across the four sites?
2. For each site, did any significant changes take place from pre to post-testing on measures of course content or attitude?

3. Did differences exist between sites at end of training on the Curriculum Specific Test and the MTAI?
4. Did any significant change in knowledge of the content areas or attitudes toward children take place from the beginning until the end of training, regardless of site?

Each of these questions will be considered in the next section, with particular emphasis on modules of instruction considered within and across sites. That is, the analyses for each module of instruction will be reported in terms of pre and post-test differences on CST scores across sites, as well as pre to post-test gains within individual training sites. Additionally, pre to post-test gains across and within sites for the MTAI were computed and will be reported. Inferences were also drawn from the PTQ and TMQ summary data and these will also be reported in this document.

Since there were only four training sites used, the applicable evaluation design was relatively simple. The only independent variable which was applicable was the geographical location of the training sites themselves. Trainees at two of the sites (Huntsville and Gallipolis) have had previous experience with the HOPE Process. Hence, this was subjectively taken into account when interpreting the results of the statistical analyses.

The statistical analyses consisted of the following: correlated t-tests on the gain scores (post-test minus pretest scores) on the CST and MTAI at each training site, and an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) on the CST and MTAI data using pretest scores as the covariate for the corresponding post-test score. The need for an ANCOVA procedure was indicated after an analysis of variance (ANOVA) of pretest scores indicated initial differences among training sites. Further, a correlational analysis of CST and MTAI post-test scores was conducted.

Evaluation Results

In this section, evaluation results are presented for the Curriculum Specific Test, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, the Training Module Questionnaire, and the Post Training Questionnaire.

Analysis of Results of the CST

Table 1 shows pre and post-test means, standard deviations, and N's on the Curriculum Specific Test. These statistics are reported only for those who took both pre and post-tests and, therefore, the N's reported may be slightly smaller than the actual number present for parts of the training. It also indicates the percent of total possible score which the pre to post-test gain represents ($\frac{\text{gain}}{\text{possible score}}$ = %).

In order to ascertain the pretest differences which existed across sites for knowledge of each module, a one-way analysis of variance was run on each of the subtests of the CST, as well as for the total of all subtests. Since each subtest measures the objectives from a given module, the results of this ANOVA give information on specific content areas. If the ANOVA was significant, multiple t-tests were performed between sites in order to determine where significant differences occurred. Complete ANOVA tables for these results can be found in Appendix G, and a discussion of the pretest results for each module is given below.

A. Module 1 (Instruction) - No pretest differences were present across sites.

B. Module 2 (Working With Others) - Gallipolis, Ohio, significantly ($p < .05$) outscored California, Pennsylvania. This difference may be due to previous training or experiences received by the Ohio

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and N's for Pre and Post-Test Curriculum Specific Measures Across Sites*

			Htsvl N=26	Galli N=12	Warren N=13	Calif N=50	Total N=101
CST 1 Instruction 44 Items	Pre	$\bar{x}$	15.69	18.33	16.15	15.50	15.97
		SD	5.20	6.36	6.54	5.70	5.72
	Post	$\bar{x}$	25.77	30.33	25.00	25.28	25.97
		SD	7.69	7.94	5.07	6.72	7.00
		% gain	23	27	20	22	23
CST 2 Working With Others 27 Items	Pre	$\bar{x}$	4.81	6.50	4.23	3.78	4.43
		SD	3.30	3.23	3.30	2.17	2.86
	Post	$\bar{x}$	13.88	18.00	9.85	12.34	13.09
		SD	5.01	4.35	3.48	4.74	4.91
		% gain	34	43	21	32	32
CST 3 HOPE Process 29 Items	Pre	$\bar{x}$	17.35	22.00	21.85	20.78	20.18
		SD	5.67	0.85	2.85	2.89	4.01
	Post	$\bar{x}$	23.12	23.58	21.31	23.44	23.40
		SD	3.06	2.02	3.82	2.62	3.04
		% gain	20	14	-2	9	11
CST 4 Child Development 24 Items	Pre	$\bar{x}$	7.58	12.42	12.92	9.32	9.70
		SD	7.38	5.85	4.21	7.03	6.83
	Post	$\bar{x}$	14.88	15.25	14.38	12.70	13.78
		SD	5.45	3.79	4.29	5.61	5.25
		% gain	30	12	6	14	17
CST Subtotal 124 Items	Pre	$\bar{x}$	45.42	59.25	55.15	46.46	49.82
		SD	15.17	14.18	11.25	14.66	14.77
	Post	$\bar{x}$	77.65	89.67	70.23	73.76	76.19
		SD	17.05	12.31	12.08	13.74	15.07
		% gain	26	25	12	20	21
CST 5 Materials 101 Items	Pre	$\bar{x}$				4.96	
		SD				5.66	
	Post	$\bar{x}$			39.23	46.90	
		SD			22.55	22.46	
		% gain				42	
CST Total 225 Items	Pre	$\bar{x}$				59.42	
		SD				38.78	
	Post	$\bar{x}$			109.77	120.66	
		SD			28.67	30.54	
		% gain				27	

* Only those trainees who took both pre and post-tests are included.

group which had been working as home visitors for more than a year.

C. Module 3 (HOPE Process) - Gallipolis and California significantly ($p < .001$) outscored Huntsville, Alabama. This finding is difficult to interpret since Gallipolis had experience with the HOPE Process and California did not; and both of these sites outscored a location (Huntsville) which also had experience with the HOPE Process. The most likely explanation would be that the California trainees had some prior knowledge of the HOPE Process obtained from their supervisors, which subsequently inflated their pretest attainment.

D. Module 4 (Child Development) - No differences across sites.

E. Total score for all modules - A significant difference ($p < .05$) existed across modules, with the Gallipolis site outscoring Huntsville. This may reflect a difference in overall verbal ability between the two groups.

Having ascertained the pretest differences across sites, the next question concerns the significance of differences between pre and post-testing for each site across the modules of instruction. The following shows results of the correlated t-tests on gain scores for all sites across modules. See appendix G for the corresponding statistical tables.

A. Module 1 (Instruction) - All sites showed significant gains ($p < .001$) from pre to post-testing on this module, with Gallipolis showing the largest gain, followed by Huntsville, California, and Warren County.

B. Module 2 (Working With Others) - All sites showed significant gains ($p < .001$) from pre to post-testing on this module again with Gallipolis showing the largest gain, followed by Huntsville, California, and Warren County in that order.

C. Module 3 (HOPE Process) - Huntsville, Gallipolis, and California showed significant gains ($p < .001$) on this module, while Warren County did not. This may be due to differences in teaching style or order of presentation at this site. Subjective impressions of an evaluator at this site indicated that the group seemed disinterested or distracted during much of this session.

D. Module 4 (Child Development) - This module showed significant gains in Huntsville ($p < .001$) and California ($p < .01$) and failed to show any gains at the other two sites. One reason for this may be that the test items measuring this module covered material which was not presented in a consistent style across the four training sites. The training techniques used in Huntsville and California are those which should be included in the revised materials.

E. Module 5 (Materials) - This module was given at all sites, but a decision was made that evaluation within training did not cover the material and that test items should be added to the CST to cover this module.

Therefore, only one site (California) has pre and post-test scores available. The gains were significant at this site ($p < .001$), and it can be assumed that the method of teaching used in this case was effective.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was performed on the post-test scores, using the pretest as the covariate. Since pre and post-test scores on Module 5 (Materials) were available from only one site, as we explained above, these scores were not included in the ANCOVA. The field test sites were the independent variable and the CST and MTAI were considered as the dependent variables. The following description summarizes the results of the ANCOVA for each variable. Complete ANCOVA tables can be found in Appendix G.

A. Module 1 (Instruction) - A significant difference existed across sites ($p < .05$) on post-tests. The mean scores for each site ranked as follows: Gallipolis, Huntsville, Warren County, California.

B. Module 2 (Working With Others) - A significant difference existed across sites ($p < .001$) on post-test after covariance. The sites' mean scores ranked as follows: Gallipolis, Huntsville, California, Warren County.

C. Module 3 (HOPE Process) - A significant difference existed across groups ($p < .001$) with mean scores for sites ranking Gallipolis, California, Warren County, and Huntsville.

D. Module 4 (Child Development) - No differences existed across sites. This finding replicates the results of the ANOVA on pretest scores, where no differences were found.

E. CST Total - A significant difference existed across sites on the total score of the CST ($p < .01$). The sites ranked as follows: Gallipolis, Warren County, Huntsville, and California. This ranking suggests that practice in teaching had no effect on the attainment of the sites, since Huntsville and Gallipolis were concurrently taught first, followed by Warren County, and then California. If practice in teaching had a large effect on attainment across groups, we would expect the ranking at sites on attainment to be the reverse of the sequence of teaching (i.e., California would rank first, and Huntsville and Gallipolis would rank last). The group at Gallipolis may have outscored their peers because of higher verbal ability and/or motivation. This is further confirmed by the relatively higher standing of Gallipolis on the pretest.

Table 2 summarizes the results of these analyses.

Table 2

CST Data Results Summary Table

CST Subtest/Module	Pretest ANOVA	Post-Test ANCOVA	Pre vs. Post t-Test
CST 1 Instruction	No diff.	Sig. diff.	Sig. gains at all 4 sites
CST 2 Working With Others	Sig. diff.	Sig. diff.	Sig. gains at all 4 sites
CST 3 HOPE Process	Sig. diff.	Sig. diff.	Sig. gains at 3 sites
CST 4 Helping Our Children Grow and Develop	Sig. diff	No diff.	Sig. gains at 2 sites
CST 5 Materials	N.A.*	N.A.	Sig. gains at only site
CST Total	Sig. diff.	Sig. diff.	Sig. gains at all 4 sites

*Not Applicable

Analysis of Results of the MTAI

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was given on a pre and post-test basis to all trainees to ascertain the existence of any changes in attitude toward children and teaching. In effect, the MTAI was a measure of secondary effects of training. Table 3 summarizes the results of the MTAI across sites.

Table 3

MTAI Pre and Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations by Sites and Total Sample

		Htsvl N=21	Galli N=12	Warren N=12	Calif N=36	Total N=81
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	39.52	24.25	42.83	29.24	36.76
	SD	39.09	39.00	34.04	35.51	46.61
Post-Test	$\bar{x}$	42.19	32.75	36.50	39.69	38.84
	SD	42.46	43.59	43.32	32.79	37.85

No pre or post-test differences existed across groups for the MTAI and no significant gains were found for any individual site or for all sites combined. Thus, no measurable changes in attitude took place as a result of training and all sites were equivalent in their attitude toward children and teaching. A significant product moment (r) correlation of $r = .45$ existed between post CST tests (Mod. 1-4) and the post MTAI scores, indicating that individuals who scored highly on the CST tended to have the highest scores on the MTAI.

Analysis of Results of the TMQ

During the training session the trainees were presented with a Training Module Questionnaire to rate each component of instruction. The data on the

items of the TMQ by modules and across modules are presented in Table 4. Appendix H contains tables of percentage responses of trainees on the items of the TMQ for modules by sites and across sites.

Across sites the trainees felt that the modules were "very interesting". The mean percentages of responses for this item showed Module 5 (Materials) to be the most interesting (84.6%) and Module 1 (Instruction) to be the least interesting (71.4%).

Most of the trainees found the modules to be "fairly simple" with the exception of Module 5 (Materials). This module was ranked "very easy" by most (57.8%).

The majority of trainees ranked the modules as being "very useful". Module 5 (Materials) received the highest percentage (71.5%) and Module 3 (HOPE Process) received the lowest percentage (62.5%).

The trainees felt that the modules were "very well presented" with the exception of Module 1 (Instruction), which most of the trainees felt was "adequate". A greater percentage of trainees (4.8%) felt that Module 3 (HOPE Process) was "poorly done" which may have influenced their opinion of the module's usefulness, as recorded above. The presentations may have been rated as "poorly done" because little structure was provided by the trainers and most work was done on an individual basis by the trainees.

The majority of the trainees felt that they could go on to the next module. Of those trainees who wished to retake a module, the highest percentage occurred for Module 3 (HOPE Process - 29.7%) and the lowest percentage occurred for Module 4 (Child Development - 21.1%).

In regard to length of segment of training, most of the trainees felt that the time interval was about right with the highest percent of responses

Table 4

Percentage Responses of Trainees on the Items of the Training Module Questionnaire (TMQ) by Modules and Across Modules

TMQ Item		Response	I	WO	HP	CD	M	Across Modules/Sites
A.	1.	Boring	2.52	2.26	2.55	1.75	1.47	2.09
	2.	All right	26.05	19.77	25.00	25.44	13.97	20.58
	3.	Interesting	71.43	77.97	72.45	72.81	84.56	77.34
B.	1.	Complicated	16.22	13.04	16.04	10.62	3.00	10.92
	2.	Fairly simple	49.55	55.43	57.75	61.95	40.90	52.10
	3.	Very easy	34.23	31.52	26.20	27.43	56.00	36.97
C.	1.	Useless	1.67	1.73	3.00	0.88	1.54	1.95
	2.	Of some help	32.50	30.06	34.50	34.51	26.93	27.59
	3.	Very useful	65.83	68.21	62.50	64.60	71.54	70.45
D.	1.	Poorly done	0.83	0.00	4.79	0.00	0.76	1.62
	2.	O.K.	52.07	26.44	46.71	38.05	22.90	29.90
	3.	Very well done	47.11	73.56	48.50	61.95	76.33	68.48
E.	1.	I wish I were home	15.05	17.36	14.84	13.33	19.33	17.14
	2.	I could go on	60.02	58.33	55.48	65.56	57.14	57.06
	3.	I could take it over	24.73	24.31	29.68	21.11	23.53	25.80
F.	1.	Wasn't enough time	20.37	16.09	14.04	18.92	33.33	19.13
	2.	Length about right	70.37	77.01	78.65	71.17	58.14	73.25
	3.	Too long	9.26	6.90	7.30	9.91	8.53	7.62
G.	1.	Many things not covered	32.14	32.93	42.37	43.40	35.16	37.70
	2.	Few things not covered	47.32	38.92	42.37	37.74	40.63	40.98
	3.	Covered everything	20.54	28.14	15.25	18.87	24.22	21.31

*Module Code: Instruction (I), Working With Others (WO), HOPE Process (HP), Child Development (CD), and Materials (M)

occurring for Module 3 (HOPE Process - 78.7%) and the lowest percentage occurring for Module 5 (Materials - 58.1%). For Module 5, 33.3% of the trainees felt that not enough time was devoted to materials.

Most of the trainees felt that there were some or many things that they needed to know about the content area of the modules. The highest percentage felt that they needed to know more about Module 3 (HOPE Process - 85.7%), while the smallest percentage of trainees felt that they needed to know more about Module 2 (Working With Others - 71.9%).

Analysis of the TMQ data with respect to sites and modules indicated that the trainees, in general, felt that the training materials were fairly simple but yet interesting. Not only did the trainees feel that the materials were generally very well done, but also that the materials would be very useful in fulfilling their role as home visitors. Most trainees, however, did express a desire to move on to the next topic even though many indicated that there were still things that they needed to know about the topics. Nearly three-fourths of the trainees indicated that the training sessions were of an appropriate length.

Analysis of Results of the PTQ

Analysis of the data obtained from the Post Training Questionnaire (Appendix E) indicated that the trainees felt that Module 3 (HOPE Process) was most directly related to what they needed to know as a home visitor.* Module 1 (Instruction) and Module 2(Working With Others) were second and third in being considered most directly related to the job requirements.

---

*The apparent contradiction between this finding and the TMQ question dealing with usefulness may be explained by the fact that much of this module was self-taught and difficult to comprehend. This is to say, the home visitors felt that the content was most relevant, but that the style of presentation was inadequate.

The trainees indicated that all modules were understood equally well except for the Child Development (Module 4) module, which was understood least. The trainees also indicated that they believed they would use the HOPE Process (Module 3) module very soon in fulfilling their role as home visitors, but that the Community Survey component of the Working With Others module (Module 2) would not be of any use in the near future. When asked to rate the overall quality of the training program, nearly three-fourths (72.7%) rated the training as good and nearly one-fourth (24.5%) rated the training as excellent. (Actual figures for the PTQ may be found in Appendix I.)

Evaluation Summary

The analyses of the data collected at the four training sites indicate overall that the trainees did learn from the instruction as measured by the CST. Even though the training materials were of a prototypic nature, in our judgment the detrimental effects (if any) of the materials being in an initial state of development were apparently overwhelmingly offset by the eagerness of the tr[illegible]s and the content per se.

A Curriculum Specific Measure (CST) was created to measure the effectiveness of the training in terms of achievement of specific program objectives. Each instructional module included objectives which were measured on the CST, as well as objectives which were assessed during training. The objectives for each module were translated into test items and were grouped into subtests on the CST. These subtests included items on Instruction, Working With Others, the HOPE Process, Helping Our Children Grow and Develop, and Materials. A total score for all modules was also computed.

The CST was administered on a pre and post-test basis at four training sites and three series of analyses were performed on the resulting data.

First, an analysis of variance on pretest scores was performed to ascertain if differences existed across sites. Second, t-tests were performed within sites to measure change from pre to post-testing. And, third, an analysis of covariance was performed across sites using pretest scores as the covariate to determine differences at the end of the training.

The Gallipolis site scored higher on the CST pre and post-test than did the other sites, which may reflect a difference in verbal ability or knowledge favoring that site. Generally, all groups showed significant gains in knowledge of the content of training from pre to post-testing. Two modules (those dealing with the HOPE Process and Child Development) failed to show statistically significant gains at all sites and should be emphasized more heavily in future revision of the training materials. The results of the analyses indicate that the materials were effective in reaching a number of the objectives included in training, and that the training package is effective with a variety of types of home visitors and programs.

A questionnaire (TMQ) was administered after each training session to elicit opinions about the various modules. Across modules (across sites, also) the modal descriptors were majority descriptors except for the last one in the following list. The descriptors which received the most frequent responses were: interesting, fairly simple, very useful, very well done, the trainee would like to go on to the next presentation, the length was about right, there are a few things which the trainees needs to know.

The module on Instruction differed from the average in that it was categorized as "fairly simple" and that the presentation was "O.K." instead of "very well done". The module on the HOPE Process differed from the average in that it failed to achieve a majority response of "very well done" on the

presentations. The Materials module was reported as "very easy" instead of "fairly simple". The module on Child Development was viewed as leaving "a lot to know" rather than leaving just a "few things to know". The module on Working With Others did not differ from the average for the other modules in the modal or majority descriptors.

A measure of attitude towards children (MTAI) was also administered on a pre and post training basis, which showed no significant change in attitudes taking place at any of the four training sites.

Finally, a Post Training Questionnaire (PTQ) was created to elicit information about the total training program. Although specific individuals felt certain topics were not adequately covered or other topics were irrelevant, most of the trainees felt that the materials were satisfactory and needed only some revision.

In view of the analyses conducted on attainment of knowledge and changes in attitude, the following general recommendations can be made:

1. Modules 3 (HOPE Process) and 4 (Child Development) need to be given more emphasis during training.
2. Module 2 (Working With Others) needs to be made more relevant to the experiences of home visitors in their professional capacity.
3. More interaction should be present between the trainer(s) and the trainees during the presentation of the HOPE Process (Module 3)
4. The CST should be revised in light of changes in program content and should be shortened to facilitate evaluation.
5. The MTAI should be deleted as a summative evaluation instrument, and should not be included as a part of the training package.

6. The TMQ should be revised from its general format and be designed specifically for each training session. Responses should also be made more specific.
7. The PTQ should be revised to provide more useful information for evaluation.

Appendix A

Outline of
Home Visitor's and Parent's Notebooks

Home Visitor's Notebook

Sections:

- Introduction
- Materials
- Instructional Techniques
- Interaction
- Child Development
- In-Service
- Resources
- Activities
- Home Visitor's Guide
- Parent's Guide
- Group Experience Guides

Parent's Notebook

Sections:

- Introduction
- Child Development
- Parent's Guide
- Activities
- Resources

Appendix B

Outline of
HOPE Training Modules

Introductory Module:

Components:

1. Hello, I am _____; who are _____?
2. Home Visitor Behaviors Test
3. Introduction to Evaluation
4. The Educational BOM
5. Pretest
6. How to Use the Home Visitor's Notebook

Module I - Instructional Techniques

Components:

1. Introduction to Teaching and Learning
2. Developing Questioning Skills
3. Building Better Listening Techniques

Module II - Working With Others

Components:

1. Developing Respect
2. Developing Effective Communication Skills
3. Developing Problem-Solving Skills
4. Developing Self-Awareness
5. Conducting a Community Survey

Module III - HOPE Process

Components:

1. What is HOPE?
2. What a Home Visitor Does.
3. Preparation for the First Visit to the Home

4. Parents as Teachers of Their Children

5. Appropriate and Inappropriate Behaviors of Home Visitors

6. Planning Home Visits

Module IV - Child Development

Components:

1. Characteristics of Children

2. Abilities of Children

3. Child Growth and Development

Module V - Materials

Components:

1. Introduction to Materials

2. Learning to Use Materials Found in the Home

3. Learning to Use Free Materials

4. Learning to Use Purchased Materials

5. Learning to Use the Parent's Notebook

Concluding Module:

Components:

1. Post-Test

2. Evaluation (by Trainees) of Training

Appendix C

List of Planned Inservice Training Modules

Modules:

I. Planning between H.V., G.E.L., F.D.

II. Teaching by modeling

III. Teaching by demonstration

IV. Teaching by discovery

V. Teaching by telling

VI. Teaching by dialogue

VII. "Regression in service of the ego"

VIII. Simple health problems of 3-, 4-, 5-year-olds

IX. Techniques of discipline

X. Techniques of communication

XI. Cognitive development of children

XII. Psychomotor development of children

XIII. Affective development of children

XIV. Behavior modification

XV. Setting up an effective instructional environment

XVI. Good mental health practices for the home

Appendix D

Curriculum Specific Test

Instructions for HOPE Training Test

The following test is designed to measure the things you will learn from the HOPE Training Package. You will take the test twice, once before training and once after its completion. When you first take the test, you are not expected to know the answers to many of the questions. You are taking the test the first time so we will know how much you know about the HOPE Program before we start. If you cannot answer any of the questions, that's fine. In any case, answer to the best of your ability both times you take the test.

Answer each question on the test sheet itself, and be sure to put your name on the top of the first sheet. Some questions will ask you to write complete answers, while others will ask you to select answers which are correct or to mark a statement true or false. If you have any questions, please ask one of your instructors.

1. To the best of your ability, define the word "question".

2. List one reason for using open questions.

3. List one reason for using closed questions.

4. From the following list of words or phrases, select those which commonly begin open questions and place a mark in the appropriate space provided beside each. Then select those which commonly begin closed questions and place a mark in the appropriate space.

Closed	Open	
—	—	in your opinion
—	—	which
—	—	could you
—	—	why do you agree
—	—	where did you
—	—	would you
—	—	what do you think about
—	—	did
—	—	why

5. Rewrite each of the following closed questions into open format (you need not answer the questions).

   A. What is the best way to bake a pineapple upside-down cake?

   B. When did Johnny first start to talk?

   C. Does Susy fell well?

6. From the follwoing list of questions, select those which call for an unlimited response and place a mark in the appropriate space. Then identify those which call for a limited response and place a mark in the appropriate space beside the word or phrase.

Unlimited	Limited	
—	—	What is.....?
—	—	What can you say about....?
—	—	Tell me about....?
—	—	What do you know about....?
—	—	When did you....?
—	—	Is there....?
—	—	What should you....?
—	—	What about....?

7. Describe two ways to encourage learners to respond to questions.

8. List ten words or phrases which can be used for positive reinforcement of a correct response to a question.

9. Define, to the best of your ability, the word "teaching".

10. Define, to the best of your ability, the word "learning".

11. From the follwoing list, circle four answers which best describe the cues used by an effective listener.

    1. Relaxed, nonchalant attitude
    2. Smiling
    3. Staring at the floor
    4. Nodding head yes
    5. Looking other person in the eye
    6. Gesturing with your hands

12. In the space below define the following ways that you can respond to remarks which encourage the learner to answer.

    A. Reward/punish -

    B. Extending information -

    C. Redirect the response -

13. To the best of your ability, list four techniques that demonstrate respect.

14. The following list of questions are those which you might ask yourself after a telephone interview regarding a community survey. Circle the three questions which are the most important.

    1. Did I ask the name of the party I spoke to?
    2. Did I introduce myself clearly?
    3. Was I pleasant?
    4. Was the telephone connection adequate?
    5. Did I state my purpose in calling?
    6. Did the other party like me?
    7. Did I make myself clear by asking questions which began with "who", "where", "how many", or "what"?

15. In order to effectively show information about a community resource, a number of important questions must be answered. In the space below, list nine of the most important questions which you can ask about a community resource.

16. All communication can be divided into three basic parts. List these parts below.

17. Effective speaking involves a number of basic techniques or principles. List three of these principles below.

18. Communication between two individuals is influenced not only by content (what you say) but by other factors as well. List five (5) nonverbal techniques that effect communication.

19. What is the major goal of the HOPE program? (Circle your answer.)

1. To make children better
2. To improve children's social responsibility
3. To improve the parent-child interaction
4. To make parents better

20. What are the major purposes of the television program? (Circle 2 answers.)

1. To keep children occupied
2. To be a "text book" for parents, children, and staff
3. To make learning fun and easily available
4. To provide an alternative to Sesame Street
5. To give children an advantage in school

21. What are the main purposes of the home visit? (Circle 4 answers.)

1. To sustain interest in the program
2. To provide information for local social agencies
3. To provide companionship for lonely parents
4. To provide related TV materials and assist the parent in learning to teach the child
5. To observe and discuss the needs of each child with the parent
6. To enlist the parent's participation in the education of the child
7. To teach the child social interaction in group settings

22. Which of the following are the main purposes of the group session? (Circle 3 answers.)

1. To provide for distribution of home materials
2. To accustom children to meeting new people
3. To help children to work and play together
4. To provide an hour's "free" time for the mother
5. To acquaint children with an atmosphere that is more like school than home

23. Do the following statements describe the process through which the HOPE materials are interrelated? (Answer true or false.)

True False 1. Through the use of materials for parents, children, and staff, based upon a common curriculum

True Fale 2. Through the use of information and suggestions for parents, children, and staff about how the program can be changed to fit the individual needs and abilities of children

24. Which of the following correctly describe the responsibilities of the home visitor? (Circle 5 answers.)

1. Serve as the primary instructor of the child
2. Demonstrate through modeling certain basic techniques that are effective in teacher/learner interactions
3. Sustain the child's interest and involvement
4. Interpret the objectives of the TV lessons, and assisting the parent in selecting an appropriate learning experience from the guide that serves the needs of the individual child
5. View the daily television lessons with the child
6. Provide and interpret basic resource material to the parent, e.g., Parents' Guide, child activity materials, and other resources as needed
7. Provide appropriate data to either materials production team, unit team, or the evaluation staff
8. Serve as a resource to the parent in obtaining and providing information about available community resources that may be used for special needs the child or family may have, and if necessary, providing assistance in obtaining these services

25. Which of the following statements describe the responsibilities of the parents involved in the HOPE program? (Circle 5 answers.)

1. Serve as primary instructor of the child
2. Locate and utilize community resources for the child
3. Participate in group training sessions
4. Interpret her goals and aspirations for the child to the home visitor
5. Provide information to the home visitor about the child's interests and progress observed throughout the week
6. Prepare the children for high level reading skills
7. Participate with the child in daily follow-up activities
8. Provide information for continuing improvement of materials and program operation

26. Circle four answers which best describe the steps in planning a home visit.

1. Obtain information on the upcoming television programs
2. Secure advice of group session leader and other home visitors during weekly conference
3. Obtain direction from field director
4. Use both formal and informal records of home visits as sources of information
5. Have a planning session by telephone with the parent
6. Consider the interests, abilities, previous activities, and progress made of both the child and the parent
7. Study Parents' Guide and Home Visitor's Guide carefully

27. Which of the following statements best describes the purpose of the weekly planning conference? (Circle one.)

    1. The purpose of the weekly conference is to obtain explicit directions from supervisory staff on the next week's activities.
    2. The purpose of the weekly planning conference of the field team is to share experiences, observations, ideas, and reactions with co-workers that will be helpful in planning for the weekly home visits and group sessions.

28. List two types of home visit records and state the purpose of each.

29-54. Use the following words and phrases to accurately fill in the chart below.

1. Tea party	10. Can Communicate	18. Controls body
2. Becomes independent	11. Group games	19. Protection from the elements
3. Trust	12. Running games	20. Finger plays
4. Uses scissors	13. Sing songs	21. Talked to
5. Food	14. Grows physically	22. Acts out nursery rhymes
6. Allowed to talk	15. Read stories	23. Develops language
7. Grows socially	16. Throws ball	24. Plays store
8. Shelter	17. Makes friends	
9. Chore		

Child Development Chart

Characteristics	Needs	Abilities	Activities

55. In the space below, list four categories of materials used in home visitation.

1.

2.

3.

4.

56. Now, list three reasons for using each category of materials.

Category 1: A.

B.

C.

Category 2: A.

B.

C.

Category 3: A.

B.

C.

Category 4: A.

B.

C.

57. For each of your four categories above, list five items that could be included in each category and list two uses for each.

	Item	Uses
Category 1:	A.	a.
		b.
	B.	a.
		b.
	C.	a.
		b.
	D.	a.
		b.
	E.	a.
		b.
Category 2:	A.	a.
		b.
	B.	a.
		b.
	C.	a.
		b.
	D.	a.
		b.
	E.	a.
		b.
Category 3:	A.	a.
		b.
	B.	a.
		b.
	C.	a.
		b.

D. a.

b.

E. a.

b.

Category 4: A. a.

b.

B. a.

b.

C. a.

b.

D. a.

b.

E. a.

b.

58. In the space below, list 10 free materials which you can obtain and indicate where each might be obtained.

	Material		Source
1.		A.	
2.		B.	
3.		C.	
4.		D.	
5.		E.	
6.		F.	
7.		G.	
8.		H.	
9.		I.	
10.		J.	

59. From the list below, select those five criteria which are most important for buying children's toys. Underline the letter of the five most important criteria.

a. Was it advertised widely?
b. Could it have more than one use?
c. Is it plastic?
d. Does it enlist the participation of the child?
e. Is it safe to use?
f. Is its design attractive?
g. Does it enable the child to develop physically?
h. Is it inexpensive?
i. Does it have small detachable parts?

Appendix E

Post-Training Questionnaire

A major factor in determining the future success of this training program is your opinion of the materials which you have received. The following questionnaire will help us to understand your reactions to the training, so please answer each question as honestly and completely as possible. Since it is not necessary to place your name on this sheet, feel free to express yourself on anything which concerns you.

1a. Which part of the training did you find most directly related to what you need to know as a home visitor?

b. Which part of the training did you find least related to what you need to know as a home visitor?

2. Which part of the training did you understand best?

3. Which part did you understand least?

4. Which part of the training do you believe you will be able to use soon?

5. Which part of the training do you feel will not be of any use in the near future?

6. Did you feel that the time taken for training was:

   a. too long
   b. about right
   c. too short

7. What do you think you still need from training that we did not supply?

8a. What would you leave out that we included?

b. Why?

9. Overall, how would you rate the quality of this training? (Circle one.)

   1. poor
   2. okay, but needs much change
   3. good, needs some change
   4. excellent, needs no change

Appendix F

Training Period #_____

Training Module Questionnaire

Please cirle the number of the word which you feel best describes the block of training time which you have just completed. Be as honest as possible in your answers (you need not put your name on the sheet).

A. The period of training which I have just taken was:

1. boring
2. all right
3. interesting

B. This period of training was:

1. complicated
2. fairly simple
3. very easy

C. I expect the content of this training period to be:

1. useless
2. of some help in my work
3. very useful

D. The presentation itself (other than the materials) was:

1. poorly done
2. O.K.
3. very well done

E. Right now I wish:

1. I were home
2. I could go on to the next presentation
3. I could take this block of time over again

F. As far as the time taken for training is concerned:

1. There really wasn't enough time to cover everything
2. The length was about right
3. The training took too long

G. Now that this period of training is over:

1. There are still a lot of things in this area which I need to know
2. There are a few things which I need to know
3. The training has covered everything I need to know about the subject

Appendix G

Table G1

Analysis of Variance Table for Pretest ANOVA

	Mean Square	df	F-test	Significance
CST 1:				
Among Groups	26.83	3	0.80	--
Within Groups	33.24	97		
CST 2:				
Among Groups	25.59	3	3.32	.05
Within Groups	7.71	97		
CST 3:				
Among Groups	100.87	3	7.42	.001
Within Groups	13.59	97		
CST 4:				
Among Groups	116.01	3	2.58	--
Within Groups	45.04	97		
CST Total 1				
Among Groups	677.30	3	3.28	.05
Within Groups	206.26	97		
MTAI Raw:				
Among Groups	830.21	3	0.37	--
Within Groups	2,252.10	78		

Table G2

Summary of Results on t-tests Between Pre and Post-Test
(Huntsville)

	Difference	SE	df	t-test	Significance
CST 1	-10.07	1.82	50	-5.54	.001
CST 2	- 9.08	1.18	50	-7.72	.001
CST 3	- 5.77	1.26	50	-4.56	.001
CST 4	- 7.31	1.80	50	-4.06	.001
CST Total 1	-32.23	4.48	50	-7.20	.001
MTAI Raw	- 2.67	12.60	40	-0.21	--

Table G3

Summary of Results on t-tests Between Pre and Post-Test
(Gallipolis)

	Difference	SE	df	t-test	Significance
CST 1	-12.00	2.94	22	-4.09	.001
CST 2	-11.50	1.56	22	-7.35	.001
CST 3	- 4.08	0.63	22	-6.45	.001
CST 4	- 2.83	2.01	22	-1.41	--
CST Total 1	-30.42	5.42	22	-5.61	.001
MTAI Raw	- 8.50	16.89	22	-0.50	--

Table G4

Summary of Results on t-tests Between Pre and Post-Test
(Warren Co.)

	Difference	SE	df	t-test	Significance
CST 1	- 8.85	2.30	24	-3.86	.001
CST 2	- 5.62	1.33	24	-4.22	.001
CST 3	0.54	1.32	24	0.41	--
CST 4	- 1.46	1.67	24	-0.88	--
CST Total 1	-15.08	4.58	24	-3.29	.01
MTAI Raw	6.33	15.91	22	0.40	--

Table G5

Summary of Results on t-tests between Pre and Post-Test
(Pennsylvania)

	Difference	SE	df	t-test	Significance
CST 1	- 9.78	1.25	98	- 7.85	.001
CST 2	- 8.56	0.70	98	-12.17	.001
CST 3	- 2.66	0.55	98	- 4.82	.001
CST 4	- 3.38	1.27	98	- 2.66	.01
CST Total 1	-25.30	2.84	98	- 8.90	.001
CST 5	-41.94	3.31	98	-12.68	.001
CST Total 2	-61.24	6.98	98	- 8.77	.001
MTAI Raw	- 2.42	10.88	71	- 0.22	--

Table G6

Summary of Results on t-tests Between Pre and Post-Test for All Sites

	Difference	SE	df	t-test	Significance
CST 1	-10.00	0.90	200	-11.06	.001
CST 2	- 8.66	0.57	200	-15.26	.001
CST 3	- 3.22	0.50	200	- 6.40	.001
CST 4	- 4.08	0.86	200	- 4.73	.001
CST Total 1	-26.38	2.11	200	-12.50	.001
MTAI Raw	- 2.08	6.70	161	- 0.31	--

Table G7

Summary of Results on CST for Post-Test ANCOVA
for All Sites (CST 1)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob.F
Regression	4	5,362.12	1,340.53	33.22	0.0001
Site	3	312.12	104.04	2.58	0.0538
Pre-Post	1	5,050.00	5,050.00	125.17	0.0001
Error	197	7,947.70	40.34		
Corrected Total	201	13,309.82			

Table G8

Summary of Results on CST for Post-Test ANCOVA
for All Sites (CST 2)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob.F
Regression	4	4,226.47	1,056.62	73.80	0.0001
Site	3	436.24	145.41	10.16	0.0001
Pre-Post	1	3,790.22	3,790.22	264.72	0.0001
Error	197	2,280.65	14.32		
Corrected Total	201	7,047.12			

Table G9

Summary of Results on CST for Post-Test ANCOVA
for All Sites (CST 3)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob.F
Regression	4	782.42	195.60	16.77	0.0001
Site	3	259.52	86.51	7.42	0.0002
Pre-Post	1	522.90	522.90	44.84	0.0001
Error	197	2,297.43	11.66		
Corrected Total	201	3,079.85			

Table G10

Summary of Results on CST for Post-Test ANCOVA
for All Sites (CST 4)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob.F
Regression	4	1,107.49	276.87	7.54	0.0001
Site	3	267.18	89.06	2.42	0.0657
Pre-Post	1	840.32	840.32	22.88	0.0001
Error	197	7,235.12	36.73		
Corrected Total	201	8,342.61			

Table G11

Summary of Results on CST for Post-Test ANCOVA for All Sites (CST Total 1)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob.F
Regression	4	38,754.92	9,688.73	46.16	0.0001
Site	3	3,621.77	1,207.26	5.75	0.0012
Pre-Post	1	35,133.15	35,133.15	167.39	0.0001
Error	197	41,349.06	209.89		
Corrected Total	201	80,103.98			

Table G12

Summary of Results on CST for Post-Test ANCOVA for All Sites (MTAI Raw)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob.F
Regression	4	4,168.41	1,042.10	0.74	0.5676
Site	3	2,850.89	950.30	0.68	0.5715
Pre-Post	1	1,317.52	1,317.52	0.94	0.6641
Error	158	222,096.44	1,405.67		
Corrected Total	162	226,264.85			

Appendix H

Table H1

Percentage Responses of Trainees on the Items of the Training Module Questionnaire for the Introduction Module* by Sites and Across Sites

TMQ Item:	A **			B			C			D			E			F			G		
Site	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Huntsville	0	43	57	0	57	43	7	36	57	7	14	79	10	72	18	15	77	8	40	50	10
Gallipolis	8	54	38	31	31	38	0	40	60	0	42	58	33	56	12	0	100	0	45	45	10
Franklin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	10	90	0	40	60	10	27	63	0	10	90	0	90	10	0	100	0	50	30	20
Across Sites	3	38	59	11	43	46	5	35	60	3	22	75	13	74	13	6	91	3	45	42	13

* A short module which was not covered in the testing.

** Refer to Appendix F for item content of TMQ.

Table H2

Percentage Responses of Trainees on the Items of the Training Module Questionnaire for the Instruction Module by Sites and Across Sites

TMQ Item:	A			B			C			D			E			F			G		
Site	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Huntsville	0	27	73	0	47	53	0	40	60	0	33	67	14	72	14	27	73	0	47	40	13
Gallipolis	0	23	77	17	55	28	3	28	69	0	44	56	20	67	13	9	72	19	38	38	24
Franklin	10	55	35	32	63	5	0	19	81	0	75	25	19	44	37	13	81	6	25	69	6
Pennsylvania	2	16	82	15	39	46	2	40	58	2	54	44	13	60	27	29	64	7	27	48	25
Across Sites	3	26	71	16	50	34	2	32	66	1	52	47	15	60	25	20	71	9	32	47	21

Table H3

Percentage Responses of Trainees on the Items of the Training Module Questionnaire for the Working With Others Module by Sites and Across Sites

TMQ Item:	A			B			C			D			E			F			G		
Site	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Huntsville	0	30	70	8	67	25	5	45	50	0	43	57	12	67	21	9	91	0	25	50	25
Gallipolis	0	22	78	25	55	20	2	34	64	0	40	60	9	48	43	23	64	13	53	38	9
Franklin	0	17	83	10	27	63	0	0	100	0	17	83	29	42	29	0	100	0	36	28	36
Pennsylvania	4	17	79	10	56	34	1	29	70	0	18	82	19	60	21	17	77	6	28	38	34
Across Sites	2	20	78	13	55	32	2	30	68	0	26	74	17	59	24	16	77	7	33	39	28

Table H4

Percentage Responses of Trainees on the Items of the Training Module Questionnaire for the HOPE Process Module by Sites and Across Sites

TMQ Item:	A			B			C			D			E			F			G		
Site	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Huntsville	0	38	62	3	55	42	0	50	50	0	32	68	3	79	18	9	88	3	35	41	24
Gallipolis	0	25	75	11	59	30	2	39	59	0	46	54	23	60	17	6	78	16	38	43	19
Franklin	2	20	78	16	61	23	0	19	81	5	51	44	10	45	45	5	90	5	38	51	11
Pennsylvania	7	22	71	30	56	14	9	33	58	11	34	55	21	46	33	32	64	4	55	36	9
Across Sites	3	25	72	16	58	26	3	35	62	5	47	49	15	55	30	14	79	7	42	42	16

Table H5

Percentage Responses of Trainees on the Items of the Training Module Questionnaire for the Child Development Module by Sites and Across Sites

TMQ Item:	A			B			C			D			E			F			G		
Site	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Huntsville	7	27	66	0	64	36	0	33	67	0	36	64	14	57	29	13	87	0	40	40	20
Gallipolis	0	38	62	0	62	38	3	47	50	0	44	56	13	81	6	0	82	18	36	46	18
Franklin	9	55	36	45	55	0	0	25	75	0	83	17	20	40	40	11	78	11	40	50	10
Pennsylvania	0	11	89	13	63	24	0	30	70	0	25	75	12	68	20	33	59	8	49	30	21
Across Sites	2	25	73	11	62	27	1	34	65	0	38	62	13	66	21	19	71	10	43	38	19

Table H6

Percentage Responses of Trainees on the Items of the Training Module Questionnaire for the Materials Module by Sites and Across Sites

TMQ Item:	A			B			C			D			E			F			G		
Site	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Huntsville	11	11	78	0	44	56	5	42	53	6	13	81	11	72	17	32	58	11	37	37	26
Gallipolis	0	10	90	0	45	55	0	18	82	0	27	73	25	75	0	0	30	70	11	33	56
Franklin	0	17	83	11	48	41	0	21	79	0	34	66	8	68	24	8	92	0	36	48	16
Pennsylvania	0	14	86	1	37	62	1	27	72	0	20	80	25	49	26	47	50	3	37	40	23
Across Sites	1	14	85	3	41	56	2	27	71	1	23	76	19	57	24	33	58	9	35	41	24

Appendix I

Summary Data
for
Post-Training Questionnaire

The following information is taken from the PTQ and is presented across sites. Due to the nature of the data (essentially non-quantitative), analysis on a site-by-site basis was not realistic (in terms of interpretations of verbal responses as a function of frequency of elicitations per site). There were 110 trainees responding to the PTQ, although all did not respond to each and every item. Only most frequent responses are listed for each of the items of the PTQ.

Item 1a. Which part of the training did you find most directly related to what you need to know as a home visitor?

There were 124 responses tallied for this item. Table IIa presents frequencies per component (and module) for those receiving the most tallies.

Table IIa

	Module/Component	Frequency	
1.	Introductory Exercises	1	
2.	HOPE Process	43	
	a. Planning Home Visits		27
	b. Appropriate and Inappropriate Behavior		7
	c. Parents as Teachers		5
3.	Materials	14	
4.	Instruction	26	
	a. Questioning		14
	b. Listening		9
5.	Working With Others	22	
	a. Respect		12
6.	Helping Children Grow and Develop	4	
7.	All Related	14	

Item 1b. Which part of the training did you find least related to what you need to know as a home visitor?

There were 73 responses tallied for this item. Table IIb presents data for Item 1b.

Table I1b

Area	Frequency
Role-Playing a Home Visitor	8
Community Survey	8
TV Programs	5
Testing	3
Everything Important	36

Item 2: Which part of the training did you understand best?

There were 92 responses tallied for this item. Table I2 presents data for Item 2.

Table I2

Module/Component	Frequency
1. Introductory Exercises	1
2. HOPE Process	19
a. Planning Home Visits	14
3. Materials	18
4. Instruction	20
a. Teaching and Learning	8
b. Listening	6
c. Questioning	6
5. Working With Others	16
a. Respect	6
b. Effective Communication	4
c. Community Survey	3
6. Helping Children Grow and Develop	6
a. Child Growth and Development	5
7. All Understood	12

Item 3: Which part did you understand least?

There were 56 responses tallied for this item. Table I3 presents data for Item 3.

Table I3

Module/Component	Frequency
1. Introductory Exercises	4
a. Testing	3
2. HOPE Process	10
a. Planning Home Visits	3
b. What is HOPE?	2
c. Preparation for First Visit	2
d. Appropriate and Inappropriate Behavior	2
3. Materials	2
4. Instruction	11
a. Questioning	10
5. Working With Others	10
a. Respect	6
6. Helping Children Grow and Develop	6
a. Characteristics of Children	4
7. Understood Everything	13

Item 4: Which part of the training do you believe you will be able to use soon?

There were 106 responses tallied for this item. Table I4 presents data for Item 4.

Table I4

Module/Component	Frequency
1. Introductory Exercises	1
2. HOPE Process	31
a. Planning Home Visits	26
3. Materials	17
4. Instruction	11
a. Questioning	6
5. Working With Others	21
a. Respect	9
b. Community Survey	5
c. Effective Communication	4
6. Helping Children Grow and Develop	1
7. All Parts	25

Item 5: Which part of the training do you feel will not be of any use in the near future?

There were 80 responses tallied for this item. Table I5 presents data for Item 5.

Table I5

	Module/Component	Frequency	
1.	Introductory Exercises	0	
2.	HOPE Process	4	
3.	Materials	1	
4.	Instruction	0	
5.	Working With Others	10	
	a. Community Survey		8
6.	Helping Children Grow and Develop	0	
7.	The Part About the TV Program	4	
8.	All Useful	60	

Item 6: Did you feel that the time taken for training was: (a) too long, (b) about right, (c) too short.

There were 109 responses tallied for this item. Table I6 presents data for Item 6.

Table I6

	Site					
	California	Huntsville	Kittanning*	Warren	Gallipolis	Total
Too Long	6	4	0	2	2	14
About Right	31	21	5	8	8	73
Too Short	14	1	2	1	0	18
Other	0	1	1	0	2	4
Total	51	27	8	11	12	109

*A subgroup of the California group.

Item 7: What do you think you still need from training that we did not supply?

There were 70 responses tallied for this item. There were 21 responses indicating that all areas of training had been covered. Six (6) responded that more time should be spend on planning methods. Twelve (12) responded that more contact with a real live home visitor including the problems associated with being a home visitor and making home visits should be included. Six (6) felt more time should be spend on child development.

Item 8: What would you leave out that we included? Why?

There were 79 responses tallied for this item. Forty-eight (48) responses indicated that nothing should be left out of the training program. Ten (10) indicated that role playing activities should be reduced or eliminated because it was in many cases a waste of time. Four (4) indicated that the community survey should be eliminated because there was usually someone with responsibilities for this task. Three (3) indicated that some videotapes/filmstrips should be deleted while three (3) also indicated that tests and questionnaires should be eliminated.

Item 9: Overall, how would you rate the quality of this training? (Circle one.)

(a) poor, (b) okay, but needs much change, (c) good, needs some change, (d) excellent, needs no change

All 110 trainees responded to this item. Table I7 presents data for Item 9.

Table I7

	Site					
	Kittanning*	Gallipolis	Warren	Huntsville	California	Total
Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Okay	0	0	0	0	0	0
Good	4	11	8	23	34	80
Excellent	3	1	4	4	15	27
No Response	1	0	0	0	2	3
Total	8	12	12	27	51	110

*A subgroup of the California group

General Comments: There were 23 general comments. Thirteen (13) indicated that the training was great. Another 10 responses dealt with the pre-post test, pacing and length of training, and lack of integration of training sessions.

Appendix J

List of Available Publications
on the HOPE Process
by the
Research and Evaluation Division

Available Evaluation Reports

School Year 1968-69

1. Evaluation Report: Early Childhood Education Program, 1969 Field Test: Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., March, 1970. ED 041 626

School Year 1969-70

2. Evaluation Report: Early Childhood Education Program, 1969-70 Field Test. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1971. (Authors: Charles Bertram, Deagelia Pena, Brainard Hines)

3. Evaluation Report: Early Childhood Education Program, 1969-70 Field Test, Summary Report. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1971. ED 052 837

4. Demographic and Socio-Economic Data of the Beckley, West Virginia Area and 1968-70 Development Costs of the Early Childhood Education Field Study. Technical Report No. 1. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., February, 1971. ED 052 832 (Author: Charles Bertram)

5. Analysis of Intelligence Scores. Technical Report No. 2. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educacional Laboratory, Inc., February, 1971. ED 052 838 (Author: Brainard Hines)

6. Attainment of Cognitive Objectives. Technical Report No. 3. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., February, 1971. ED 052 833 (Author: Brainard Hines)

7. Detailed Analysis of Language Development of Preschool Children In ECE Program. Technical Report No. 4. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., February, 1971. ED 052 834 (Author: Brainard Hines)

8. Analysis of Visual Perception of Children in the Early Childhood Education Program (Results of the Marianne Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception). Technical Report No. 5. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., February, 1971. ED 052 839 (Author: Brainard Hines)

9. Factor Analysis of the Early Childhood Education Test Data. Technical Report No. 6. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., February, 1971. ED 052 840 (Author: Deagelia Pena)

10. Social Skills Development in the Early Childhood Education Project. Technical Report No. 7. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., February, 1971. ED 052 835 (Authors: Deagelia Pena and George Miller)

11. Results of Parent and Student Reaction Questionnaire. Technical Report No. 8. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., January, 1971. ED 052 836 (Author: Brainard Hines)

12. Analysis of Children's Reactions to AEL's Preschool Television Program. Technical Report No. 9. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1970. ED 052 841. (Author: George Miller)

13. A Comparison of Parents' Attitudes Toward AEL's "Around the Bend" and Other Children's Television Programs. Technical Report No. 10. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1970. ED 052 842 (Author: Charles Bertram)

School Year 1970-71

14. Summative Evaluation of the Appalachia Preschool Education Program. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1971. ED 062 024* (Authors: Charles Bertram, Brainard Hines, and Randolph MacDonald)

15. Demographic and Socioeconomic Data of the Beckley, West Virginia Area and 1968-1971 Development Costs of AEL's Preschool Education Field Study. Technical Report No. 11. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1971. ED 052 832 (Authors: Charles Bertram and Randolph MacDonald)

16. Analysis of Intelligence Scores. Technical Report No. 13. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1971. ED 062 016 (Author: Randolph MacDonald)

17. Attainment of Cognitive Objectives. Technical Report No. 14. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1971. ED 062 017 (Author: Brainard Hines)

18. Detailed Analysis of the Language Development of Children in AEL's Preschool Education Program. Technical Report No. 15. Charleston, W. Va." Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., January, 1972. ED 062 018 (Author: Brainard Hines)

19. Analysis of Visual Perception of Children in the Appalachia Preschool Education Program. Technical Report No. 16, Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1971. ED 062 019 (Author: Brainard Hines)

* The title was later changed to Summative Evaluation of the Home-Oriented Preschool Education Program, Summary Report to reflect a change in the name of the early childhood education program.

20. Factor Analysis of the Appalachia Preschool Education Program Test Data. Technical Report No. 17. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1971. ED 062 020 (Author: Randolph MacDonald)

21. Analysis of Social Skills Development in the Appalachia Preschool Education Program. Technical Report No. 18. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., January, 1972. ED 062 021 (Author: Deagelia Pena)

22. A Comparison of Parents' Attitudes Toward AEL's "Around the Bend" and Other Children's Television Programs. Technical Report No. 21. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1971. (Authors: Charles Bertram and Randolph MacDonald)

23. Measuring Children's Curiosity. Technical Report No. 22. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., December, 1971. ED 062 022 (Author: George Miller)

24. A Comparison of AEL's Preschool Education Program with Standard Kindergarten Programs. Technical Report No. 23. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., Janaury, 1972. ED 062 023 (Author: Charles Bertram)

School Year 1971-72

25. Summative Evaluation of the Home-Oriented Preschool Education Program During the 1971-72 Demonstration Phase. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., January, 1972. ED 062 023 (Author: Charles Bertram)

26. Marketable Preschool Education Program: Basic Program Plan. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., April, 1972.

School Year 1972-73

27. The Application of a Model for the Evaluation of Educational Products. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., February, 1973. (Authors: Charles Bertram, Gary Borich, Desmond Cook, Brainard Hines, Charles Kenoyer, and Ermel Stepp)

28. AEL Home Visitors' Perceptions of Their Role. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., April, 1973. (Authors: Joe Shively and Freida Gregory)

29. Appalachia Needs HOPE: The Need for and Capability of the Appalachia Educational Laboratory to Develop a New Preschool Television Program. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1973. (Authors: Charles Bertram, Benjamin Bailey, Brainard Hines, Joe Shively, and Ermel Stepp)

30. Marketable Preschool Education Program Theoretical Base and Needs. Technical Report No. 24. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1973. (Author: Ermel Stepp)

31. Preschool Education Programs: An Analytical Comparison. Technical Report No. 25. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1973. (Author: Benjamin Bailey)

32. Demographic and Marketing Data for the Marketable Preschool Education Program. Technical Report No. 26. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1973. (Author: Ermel Stepp)

33. Selection of Crtieria for the Home-Oriented Preschool Education Television Series. Technical Report No. 27. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1973. (Author: Charles Bertram)

34. Children's Reactions to Types of Television Presentation. Technical Report No. 28. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1973. (Author: Brainard Hines)

35. Commercial Television Personnel's Review of the Technical Quality and Marketability of AEL's "Around the Bend" Pilot Tapes. Technical Report No. 29. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1973. (Author: Joe Shively)

36. State Department Early Childhood Education Program Specialists' Review of the Content and Technical Quality of AEL's "Around the Bend" Pilot Tapes. Technical Report No. 30. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1973. (Author: Joe Shively)

37. Educational Television Personnel's Review of the Technical Quality, Content Criteria, and Marketability of AEL's "Around the Bend" Pilot Tapes. Technical Report No. 31. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., June, 1973. (Author: Joe Shively)

38. Marketable Preschool Education Program Evaluation Plan. Technical Report No. 33. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., May, 1973. (Author: Joe Shively)

39. Children's Reactions to Segments of a Children's Television Series. Technical Report No. 34. Charleston, W. Va.: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., June, 1973. (Authors: Dick Cagno and Joe Shively)